UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,630	03/24/2004	Daniel Danker	MS1-1879US	7478

22801 7590 03/05/2009

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
TAYLOR, JOSHUA D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2426	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,630	DANKER, DANIEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSHUA TAYLOR	2426	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-15 and 19-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-15 and 19-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191).

Regarding claim 1, Walker discloses **a method implemented by a client device, the method comprising: receiving, by the client device, a user request to record a television program that is scheduled for broadcast** (paragraph [0038]); **recording, by the client device, the television program, when the television program is broadcast** (paragraph [0038]); **receiving, by the client device, a user request to render the recorded television program** (paragraph [0028]); **identifying the advertisement associated with the recorded television program** (Fig. 2, paragraph [0059], lines 1-10); **and rendering an advertisement in conjunction with rendering the recorded television program** (Fig. 4A-4B, paragraph [0064], lines 19-20). However, Walker does not explicitly disclose **maintaining, by the client device,**

the advertisement associated with the television program, wherein the advertisement is maintained independently of the recorded television program. However, in analogous art, Khusheim discloses that programs can be transmitted and stored separately from commercials (Fig. 1, elements 104 and 110, 126 and 128, paragraphs [0024], [0027] and [0029]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to allow the advertisements to be maintained independently of the programs. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the advertisements could be received at different times than the programs, and then combined when the user chose to watch a recorded program.

Regarding claim 15: **One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method as recited in claim 1.** This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1, as the method of claim 1 could obviously be contained on a computer-readable media.

Claims 4-6, 19, 22-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and further in view of Sie et al. (Pub. No.: 2004/0030599).

Regarding claim 4, the combined teachings of Walker and Khusheim disclose **the method as recited in claim 1,** and Khusheim further discloses **wherein the advertisement data is received independent of the broadcast television program.** However, neither Walker nor Khusheim explicitly disclose **wherein maintaining, by the client device, an advertisement**

comprises: transmitting data to a server, the data identifying the broadcast television program that is scheduled to be recorded; and receiving advertisement data associated with the broadcast television program that is scheduled to be recorded. However, in analogous art, Sie discloses that information such as scheduled recordings can be stored in a preference database for use by a transmission system (paragraph [0049]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to target an advertisement based on a program that is scheduled to record. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that having more user preferences to use in targeting the advertisements would allow the advertisements to be more specific to the user's interests.

Regarding claim 5, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 4,** and Walker further discloses **wherein the advertisement data comprises advertisement video content** (paragraph [0033], lines 9-13).

Regarding claim 6, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 4,** and Walker further discloses **wherein the advertisement data comprises an advertisement image** (paragraph [0033], lines 9-13).

Regarding claim 19, Walker discloses **a system comprising: a processor; a memory** (Fig. 1, elements 54 and 60, paragraph [0037]); **and an ad targeting application stored in the memory and executed on the processor, the ad targeting application configured to perform a method comprising: identifying an advertisement to be associated with the broadcast television program** (Fig. 2, paragraph [0059], lines 1-10). However, Walker does not explicitly disclose **receiving, from a recording device, data identifying a broadcast television program scheduled to be recorded on the recording device.** However, in analogous art, Sie discloses

that information such as scheduled recordings can be stored in a preference database for use by a transmission system (paragraph [0049]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to target an advertisement based on a program that is scheduled to record. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that having more user preferences to use in targeting the advertisements would allow the advertisements to be more specific to the user's interests.

Neither Walker nor Sie disclose **causing the advertisement to be transmitted to the recording device separately from the broadcast television program, whereby the advertisement is maintained by the recording device separate from the broadcast television program.** However, in analogous art, Khusheim discloses that programs can be transmitted and stored separately from commercials (Fig. 1, elements 104 and 110, 126 and 128, paragraphs [0024], [0027] and [0029]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker and Sie to allow the advertisements to be maintained independently of the programs. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the advertisements could be received at different times than the programs, and then combined when the user chose to watch a recorded program.

Regarding claim 22, Walker discloses **one or more computer-readable media comprising computer-readable instructions which, when executed, cause a computer system to perform a method comprising: receiving a user request to record a broadcast television program** (paragraph [0038]). However, Walker does not explicitly disclose **transmitting data identifying the broadcast television program to a server system.** However, in analogous art, Sie discloses that information such as scheduled recordings can be stored in a

preference database for use by a transmission system (paragraph [0049]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to target an advertisement based on a program that is scheduled to record. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that having more user preferences to use in targeting the advertisements would allow the advertisements to be more specific to the user's interests.

Neither Walker nor Sie explicitly disclose **receiving from the server system, an advertisement associated with the broadcast television program, wherein the advertisement is received from the server system, separately from the broadcast television program; and maintaining the advertisement on the computer system for subsequent presentation in conjunction with a recorded copy of the broadcast television program, wherein the advertisement is maintained separate from the recorded copy of the broadcast television program.** However, in analogous art, Khusheim discloses that programs can be transmitted and stored separately from commercials (Fig. 1, elements 104 and 110, 126 and 128, paragraphs [0024], [0027] and [0029]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker and Sie to allow the advertisements to be maintained independently of the programs. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the advertisements could be received at different times than the programs, and then combined when the user chose to watch a recorded program.

Regarding claim 23, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22,** and Walker further discloses **the method further comprising recording the broadcast television program; receiving a user request to view the recorded copy of the broadcast television program; and rendering the**

advertisement that is maintained on the computer system in conjunction with rendering the recorded copy of the broadcast television program (paragraph [0061])**.**

Regarding claim 26, the combined teachings of Walker and Sie discloses **one or more computer-readable media comprising computer-readable instructions which, when executed, cause a computer system to perform a method comprising: receiving from a client device, data identifying a broadcast television program that is scheduled to be recorded by the client device; identifying an advertisement associated with the broadcast television program** (See the rejection of claim 22). Neither Walker nor Sie explicitly disclose **causing the advertisement to be transmitted to the client device, independent of the broadcast television program.** However, in analogous art, Khusheim discloses that programs can be transmitted and stored separately from commercials (Fig. 1, elements 104 and 110, 126 and 128, paragraphs [0024], [0027] and [0029]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker and Sie to allow the advertisements to be maintained independently of the programs. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the advertisements could be received at different times than the programs, and then combined when the user chose to watch a recorded program.

Claims 7, 8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and further in view of Sie et al. (Pub. No.: 2004/0030599) and Paxton et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0158858).

Regarding claim 7, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 4,** but do not disclose **wherein the advertisement data comprises advertisement metadata, the metadata comprising business rules associated with an advertisement.** However, in analogous art, Paxton discloses that the advertisements can include identifying information, such as the dates they should be played (paragraph [0086], lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include data comprising business rules associated with an advertisement. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, as it would allow the advertisers to choose when their advertisements are to be watched.

Regarding claim 8, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 7,** and Paxton further discloses **wherein the business rules comprise at least one of: an indicator of how often the advertisement is to be played, an indicator of which trick modes are to be disabled during the playing of the advertisement, an expiration date associated with the advertisement, a day of the week that the advertisement is to be played, or a time of day at which the advertisement is to be played** (paragraph [0086], lines 16-22)**.** This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 7.

Regarding claim 24, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 23,** but do not disclose **the method further comprising-selecting, based on a day and/or time, the advertisement from multiple advertisements associated with the broadcast television program.** However, in analogous art, Paxton discloses that the advertisements can include identifying information, such as the dates they should be played (paragraph [0086], lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include data comprising business rules associated with an advertisement. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, as it would allow the advertisers to choose when their advertisements are to be watched.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and further in view of Levy (Pub. No.: US 2003/0192060).

Regarding claim 9, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 1,** but do not disclose **wherein the rendering the advertisement in conjunction with rendering the recorded television program comprises: initiating a rendering of the advertisement; and in an event the entire advertisement has been rendered, rendering the recorded television program; in an event that the advertisement has not been entirely rendered, refusing to render the recorded television program.** However, in analogous art, Levy discloses that a trick mode of operation, such as fast-forward, can be prevented during the playback of a commercial (paragraph [0034]), so that advertisers do not pay for commercials that are never viewed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prevent the user from viewing normal programming until the commercial had been viewed. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, as it would give advertisers confidence that users were actually viewing the commercials for which air-time was purchased.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and further in view of Paxton et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0158858).

Regarding claim 10, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the rendering the advertisement in conjunction with rendering the recorded television program comprises: rendering the recorded television program, wherein data for rendering the advertisement is stored on the client device, separate from the recorded television program;** but do not disclose **detecting, by the client device, initiation of a user-submitted pause command before conclusion of the recorded television program rendering the advertisement while the recorded television program is paused, and upon detection of termination of the pause command, continuing to render the recorded television program.** However, in analogous art, Paxton discloses that a commercial can be inserted and played when a user has paused playback of a program (paragraph [0104], lines 1-3) as a way to use a time when the user is not watching a program to play an advertisement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to insert a targeted advertisement when a user pauses on-demand content, and to render the on-demand media content upon detection of termination of the pause command. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, since having more opportunities to display commercials would have been highly desirable in the art, as it would allow the advertisers more chances to advertise their products.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and further in view of Ozer et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,708,335).

Regarding claim 11, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 1,** and in analogous art Ozer discloses **further comprising: generating, by the client device, data associated with the rendering of the advertisement by the client device** (Fig. 4, column 10, lines 18-20)**; and transmitting, by the client device, the data associated with the rendering of the advertisement to a server system** (Fig. 4, column 10, lines 61-65)**.** Ozer discloses tracking viewer behavior of advertisements in order for advertisers to better understand the effectiveness of their advertising. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to track the add data associated with the targeted advertisements. Being able to give the advertisers more detailed information on how their advertisements are used would have been highly desirable, as it would allow advertisers to more accurately target their advertisements.

Regarding claim 12, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 11,** and Ozer further discloses **wherein the generating comprises recording a date at which the advertisement is played** (Fig. 4, column 10, lines 61-65)**.** This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

Regarding claim 13, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 11,** and Ozer further discloses **wherein the generating comprises recording a**

time at which the advertisement is played (Fig. 4, column 10, lines 61-65)**.** This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 11.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and Ozer et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,708,335), as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Sie et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0030599) and Merriman et al. (Patent No.: US 5,948,061).

Regarding claim 14, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the method as recited in claim 11,** but do not disclose **wherein the generating comprises recording an indicator of whether or not a viewer attempted to fast-forward through the advertisement.** However, the combined teaching of Sie and Merriman does. Sie discloses that it may be necessary to prevent a user from fast forwarding through a commercial, as this would mean the advertiser paid for an advertisement that was never seen by the user (Sie, paragraph [0141], lines 1-11). However, Sie does not disclose recording an indication of when this prevention occurs. Merriman discloses that a server can keep track of various user interactions with the advertisements in order to provide advertisers with a better understanding of how to target the display of the advertisements (Merriman, column 7, lines 26-31, column 8, lines 32-37 and 44-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to track and report to the server system when a user tried to fast forward through a commercial. Letting advertisers know when a user had tried to fast forward through a

commercial would have been a highly desirable feature in the art, as it would allow advertisers to have a better understanding of how to target the display of the advertisements.

Claims 20, 21, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and Sie et al. (Pub. No.: 2004/0030599), and further in view of Ozer et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,708,335).

Regarding claim 20, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the system as recited in claim 19,** but do not disclose **further comprising an ad tracking application stored in the memory and executed on the processor, the ad tracking application configured to receive and store ad tracking data associated with an advertisement that has been rendered in conjunction with previously recorded or on-demand media content.** However, Ozer does (column 10, lines 18-20, 61-65). Ozer discloses that the date and time that events are performed can be tracked. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to track conditions under which the advertisement was rendered. This would have been a highly desirable feature, as it would allow the advertisers to know when their advertisements were being watched.

Regarding claim 21, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the system as recited in claim 20,** and Ozer further discloses **wherein the ad tracking data identifies a date and time at which the advertisement was played** (column 10, lines 18-20, 61-65)**.** This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 20.

Regarding claim 25, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 23,** and Ozer discloses **the method further comprising recording tracking data that describes conditions associated with the rendering of the advertisement; and transmitting the tracking data to the server system.** However, Ozer does (column 10, lines 18-20, 61-65). Ozer discloses that the date and time that events are performed can be tracked. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to track conditions under which the advertisement was rendered. This would have been a highly desirable feature, as it would allow the advertisers to know when their advertisements were being watched.

Regarding claim 27, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 26,** and Ozer discloses **the method further comprising receiving, from the client device, tracking data that describes conditions associated with a rendering of the advertisement.** However, Ozer does (column 10, lines 18-20, 61-65). Ozer discloses that the date and time that events are performed can be tracked. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to track conditions under which the advertisement was rendered. This would have been a highly desirable feature, as it would allow the advertisers to know when their advertisements were being watched.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0042914) in view of Khusheim (Pub. No.: US 2003/0221191), and further in view of Paxton et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0158858) and Ozer et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,708,335).

Regarding claim 22, Walker discloses **a method implemented by an on-demand media server** (paragraphs [0027] and [0038]), **the method comprising: receiving from a client device, a user request to render on-demand media content** (paragraphs [0037] and [0038]); **identifying an advertisement associated with the on-demand media content** (Fig. 2, paragraph [0059], lines 1-10). However, Walker does not explicitly disclose wherein **the advertisement is maintained independently from the on- demand media content, causing the advertisement to be transmitted to the client device, independently from a transmission of the on-demand media content; causing a metadata to be transmitted to the client device, independently from a transmission of the on-demand media content.** However, in analogous art, Khusheim discloses that programs can be transmitted and stored separately from commercials (Fig. 1, elements 104 and 110, 126 and 128, paragraphs [0024], [0027] and [0029]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to allow the advertisements to be maintained independently of the programs. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the advertisements could be received at different times than the programs, and then combined when the user chose to watch a recorded program.

Neither Walker not Khusheim disclose **identifying metadata associated with the advertisement, the metadata comprising business rules associated with the advertisement, the business rules comprising at least one rule selected from a list of rules, the list of rules**

comprising: an indicator of how oven the advertisement is to be played; an indicator of which trick modes are to be disabled during the playing of the advertisement; an expiration date associated with the advertisement; a day of the week that the advertisement is to be played; and a time of day at which the advertisement is to be played. However, in analogous art, Paxton discloses that the advertisements can include identifying information, such as the dates they should be played (paragraph [0086], lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include data comprising business rules associated with an advertisement. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, as it would allow the advertisers to choose when their advertisements are to be watched.

Neither Walker, Khusheim nor Paxton disclose **receiving from the client device, tracking data associated with a rendering of the advertisement by the client device, wherein the tracking data comprises at least one data type selected from a list of data types, the list of data types comprising: a date the advertisement was played by the client device; a time the advertisement was played by the client device; and an indicator indicating a user attempt to fast-forward the advertisement while the advertisement was played.** However, in analogous art, Ozer discloses tracking viewer behavior of advertisements in order for advertisers to better understand the effectiveness of their advertising (Fig. 4, column 10, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to track the add data associated with the targeted advertisements. Being able to give the advertisers more detailed information on how their advertisements are used would have been highly desirable, as it would allow advertisers to more accurately target their advertisements.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA TAYLOR whose telephone number is (571)270-3755. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm, M-F, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Josh Taylor/
Examiner, Art Unit 2426

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426